



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/896,110	07/02/2001	Nenad Rijavec	BLD9010021	5070	
30743	7590 06/28/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			COUSO,	COUSO, JOSE L	
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	RESTON, VA 20190		2621	THE DRIVEN DER	
		•	DATE MAILED: 06/28/200:	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/896,110	RIJAVEC ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jose L. Couso	2621					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory perions of NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days dealth apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09	<u>June 2005</u> .						
•	·						
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
_	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.	· · · 						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
· _	•						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.05(a).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		` ,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not receive	u.					
Attachment(s)		•					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite					
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	8) 5)	atent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 09/896,110 Page 2

Art Unit: 2621

1. Applicant's arguments filed June 9, 2005, with respect to claims 1-6, have been fully considered and are persuasive, the examiner is therefore withdrawing the prior art rejection of claims 1-6.

- 2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6 are drawn to a method of coding that merely manipulates data or an abstract idea, or merely solves a mathematical problem without a limitation to a practical application in the technological arts.

In order for a claimed invention to accomplish a practical application, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result" *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02 (see MPEP 2106.II.A). A practical application can be achieved through recitation of "a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan", or "limited to a practical application within the technological arts" (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)). Currently, claims 1-6 meet neither of these criteria. In order to for the claimed process to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result, recitation of one or more of the following elements is suggested:

 The manipulation of data that represents a physical object or activity transformed from outside the computer (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)). Application/Control Number: 09/896,110

Art Unit: 2621

A recitation of a physical transformations outside the computer, for example in

Page 3

A direct recitation of a practical application in the technological arts (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(ii)).

the form of pre or post computer processing activity (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)).

4. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-10 are drawn to non-functional descriptive material.

MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a) (Nonfunctional Descriptive Material) states:

"Descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101."

"Where certain types of descriptive material, such as music, art, photographs and mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, are merely stored so as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing process performed by the computer, then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer."

"For example, music is commonly sold to consumers in the form of a compact disc. In such cases, the know compact disc acts as nothing more than a carrier for nonfunctional descriptive material. The purely nonfunctional descriptive material cannot alone provide the practical application for the manufacture."

MPEP 2106.IV.B.1 (Nonstatutory Subject Matter) states:

"When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement".

Claims 7-10 currently recites "a data format for a block of encoded data". There is no functional relationship imparted by this data to a computing device, applicant's amendment which inserts "decoder" in the claims is not a computing device. Therefore, the claims are drawn to non-functional descriptive material which is non-statutory per se. The fact that the claim recites a computer readable medium does not provide the utility (i.e., practical application in the technological arts) required under 35 U.S.C. 101 for the manufacture.

5. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-10 are drawn to functional descriptive material which can be embodied on a computer readable medium (i.e., "data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component" at MPEP 2106.IV.B(1)). However, the program/algorithm itself merely manipulates data or an abstract idea, or merely solves a mathematical problem without a limitation to a practical application in the technological arts. MPEP 2106.IV.B.2(a) (Statutory Product Claims) states:

"A claim limited to a ... manufacture, which has a practical application in the technological arts, is statutory."

In order for a claimed invention to accomplish a practical application, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result" *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02 (see MPEP 2106.II.A). Currently, the claim does not recite a practical application. In order to for the claimed product to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result, recitation of one or more of the following elements is suggested:

Application/Control Number: 09/896,110

Art Unit: 2621

 The manipulation of data that represents a physical object or activity transformed from outside the computer (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)).

Page 5

- A physical transformations outside the computer, for example in the form of pre or post computer processing activity (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)).
- A direct recitation of a practical application in the technological arts (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(ii)).
- 6. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-10 are drawn to functional descriptive material NOT claimed as residing on a computer readable medium. MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a) (Functional Descriptive Material) states:

"Data structures not claimed as embodied in a computer-readable medium are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer."

"Such claimed data structures do not define any structural or functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized."

Claims 7-10, while defining a decoder, does not define a "computer-readable medium" and is thus non-statutory for that reasons. A decoder can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" in order to make the claim statutory.

Art Unit: 2621

"In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with the data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory." - MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a)

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jose L. Couso whose telephone number is (571) 272-7388. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso, can be reached on (703) 272-7695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the USPTO contact Center whose telephone number is (703) 308-4357.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jic June 21, 2005

JOSE L. COUSE)
PRIMARY EXAMINER